

MM53
R71 12
THE

RECTOR OF PRESCOTT,

AND

HIS LATE CONGREGATION.

A STATEMENT OF FACTS.

"And they were scattered, because there is no shepherd; thus saith the Lord God; behold I am against the Shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hands."—XXXIV Ezekiel 5: 10.

"As when a prowling wolf,
Whom hunger drives to seek new hunt for prey,
Watching where shepherds pen their flocks at eve
In hurdled coets amid the field
Leaps o'er the fence with ease into the fold;
Or as a thief bent to unloose the catch
Of some rich burgher, whose substantial doors,
Cross-bar'd and bolted fast, fear no assault,
In at the window climbs or o'er the tiles;
So climb the first grand thief into God's fold:
So since into his Church lewd hirelings climb."

—JOHN MILTON.

PRESCOTT:

"MESSENGER" STEAM PRESSER, KING STREET.

1861.

THE

RECTOR OF PRESCOTT,

AND

HIS LATE CONGREGATION.

A STATEMENT OF FACTS.

"And they were scattered, because there is no shepherd; thus saith the Lord God; behold I am against the Shepherds; and I will require my flock at their hands —XXXIV Ezekiel 5, 10.

"As when a prowling wolf,
Whom hunger drives to seek new haunt for prey,
Watching where shepherds pen their flocks at eve
In hurdled cootes amid the field secure,
Leaps o'er the fence with ease into the fold;
Or as a thief bent to unloose the cash
Of some rich burgher, whose substantial doors,
Cross barred and bolted fast, fear no assault,
In at the window climbs or o'er the tiles;
So clomb the first grand thief into God's fold:
So since into his Church lowd hirelings climb."

—JOHN MILTON.

PRESCOTT:

"MESSENGER" STEAM PRESSER, KING STREET.

1861.

T
very
the
suffi
spec
des

T
nin
of d
in t
hav
W
no
mo
is s

for
fec
sw
aw
we
th

TO THE READER.

THE composition of the following Pamphlet has necessarily been very hurried. It was deferred from week to week, in the hope that the Rev. Richard Lewis would have sufficient good sense, and sufficient good feeling, to quit a Parish where he is no longer respected. That hope is unfortunately fallacious; he seems to be destitute of both.

These pages have accordingly been written, literally with a running pen; and they doubtless contain in consequence many faults of diction, for which due apology is now tendered. Strength of facts, in the present case, will amply redeem any weakness of style. We have "nothing extenuated, nor set down aught in malice."— We have had recourse to no equivocation; we have attempted no legerdemain. Honesty is the best policy. Falsification moreover is useless, and casuistry superfluous where the evidence is already damning, and the conclusions inevitable.

Having to deal with Mr. Lewis, we have been perfectly candid; for, as the "Country Parson" observes in one of his Essays, "Perfect candor foils the crafty man, as the sturdy Highlander's broad sword at once cut down the French master of fence, vapouring away with his rapier. You cannot beat a rogue with his own weapons. Try him with truth: like David, he 'has not proved that armor'; he is quite unaccustomed to it, and he goes down."

Prescott, March 23rd, 1861.

A STATEMENT OF FACTS.

We are about to unveil with a trembling hand, a melancholy picture of human frailty. We are about to tear the mask from the face of hypocrisy, and to arraign before the bar of public justice a man whom we believe to be a dangerous impostor. With a full appreciation of their import, we repeat the words—a dangerous impostor.

Late events have taught us that clemency is misplaced where the culprit is impenitent: and we are at length convinced, that we cannot impeach too openly, or denounce too strongly, one whom neither the maturity of his years, nor the solemnity of his marriage-vow, the sacredness of his office, nor even the dread of punishment, has deterred from being guilty of gross misconduct, "unbecoming a clergyman, and tending to bring scandal on the church."

We may affirm in his case what Daniel Webster once said on a memorable occasion: "Against the prisoner at the bar as an individual, I can not have the slightest prejudice. I would not do him the slightest injury or injustice. *But I do not affect to be indifferent to the punishment of his guilt.*"

Before, however, entering upon the necessary details, we may be permitted to quote, as pertinent to the subject, the following remarks of an intelligent churchman, which are well worthy of public attention:

"The great fault of our church is, that it is a profession, not a vocation, or that vocation where it exists is an accident, not an essential. What are the motives that induce the generality of young men to take Holy Orders? There is a living in the family; or there is church patronage in some friendly hands; or the status of a clergyman is regarded as desirable, giving as it does a respectable footing in the world, and access to society. These are not the only motives, but they are the too common motives. There are men, no doubt, who enter the Church to devote their time to the service of religion, but they pass in common with others whose motives are more worldly, the church taking small pains to ascertain the dispositions of candidates for its ministration. It is the opposite case to the *facilis descensus*. The access to the Church is most easy; the way out hardly to be found for the worst offenders."

We readily grant that the bad cases are exceptional, but the exceptions are by far too numerous. We sincerely believe that the sound part of the body of the clergy was never so good as it is now—that never was there more zeal and active desire to do good—never a greater number of exemplary lives, (for the clergy have improved like all other educated orders,) but the church has thus the benefit of virtues which it has taken much pains to secure, while it is disgraced by vices which it wants the means to expel. Either the way into the Church should be made more difficult, or the way out of it more easy. Both would be best. Youths should not be admitted before there has been time for their characters to be formed, and also observed. Mistakes even then will be made, but the mistakes will be less frequent than they are under the present system, in which too superficial an enquiry is instituted into the moral qualifications of the candidate for ordination.

With reference to the case of Mr. Bonwell in England (like the Rev. R. Lewis, he also is the Rector of a Parish, but his conduct is even more scandalous than that of the Canadian Rector,) the Times excellently remarks: "It certainly is the case that we do not hear of such a proportion of delinquencies among men of other callings requiring education and honorable conduct. The only solution we can find is in the fact that a number of men yearly take orders who are entirely unfitted for their sacred calling.—The number of exemplary men who enter the Church are liable at any time to be disgraced by the conduct of some one whose character should have prevented any Bishop from ordaining him at least without a long probation. We speak of facts which are perfectly notorious. A man totally unfit for clerical life is ordained, sent into a parish, and obliged to subject himself to artificial restraints which gall him, while at the same time his position gives him peculiar influence over the people he lives among, especially over women. We cannot wonder that in these circumstances scandal should frequently occur."

Make *remorse* a *non morosa*, as the phrase is; in the present case a black sheep, or rather a wolf in sheep's clothing. The Rector of Prescott is a convicted transgressor, but he craves to be regarded as a persecuted martyr. His wish, considering that he is in the Slough of Despond, is by no means unnatural, and occasions us *elderly* queries. Nevertheless we cannot permit him to enjoy his wish. We cannot allow him to turn the tables so readily upon us, without exposing the ruse, and as the table turning in this instance is to be undertaken by the subtle sinner of a proficent in juggling, we will carefully indicate each pincer of the manoeuvre, and unmask to the public the charlatan who would mystify them.

We do not know his well-grounded secrets, what was the character of Mr. Lewis previous to his ordination. If his conduct in any way resembled what it has been lately, he was a perfect utility and to be crucified.

There is a French proverb which says, that it is not the cow that makes the monk. And this is true: for a member of a good and holy association is not necessarily himself holy and good. Satan, we know, was once an Angel of Light. Judas Iscariot was one of Christ's Apostles. The Reverend Richard Lewis is a clergyman of the Church of England.

We can imagine a case somewhat similar to, and yet how unlike, that of the latter individual, which would stir the sympathies and arouse the pity of almost all who reflect on it. We can picture to ourselves a man, who has lived an almost blameless life, untainted by vice, and unspotted from the world. We can imagine this man yielding in an unguarded moment to the alluring spell of some mighty temptation, and committing in the brief delirium of excitement a crime for which years of remorse and solemn penitence can alone atone, and which demolishes in an instant the fair-proportioned edifice of his former life, leaving his character a moral ruin! Such a picture has been drawn by the master hand of a noble Scotch Divine; and, with some slight alteration, we reproduce it here, as it describes in pathetic language what ought to have been, and perhaps were, the feelings of the Rector of Prescott, when the recent disclosure of his misdeeds took place. "Once a year, when church-courts meet, our city may present a spectacle which fools regard with indifference, but wise men with compassion and fear. A pale and haggard man, bearing the title of "Reverend," stands at the bar of his church. Not daring to look up, he bends there with his head buried in his hands, blushes on his face, his lips quivering, and a hell raging, burning within him, as he thinks of home, and a broken-hearted wife. Ah, my brother there! And ah, my brethren here, learn to 'watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation.' See there the issue of all a mother's anxieties, and a father's self-denying and parsimonious toil to educate their promising and studious boy. In this deep darkness has set forever a brilliant college career.—Alas! what an end to the solemn day of ordination, and the bright day of marriage, and all those Sabbaths when an affectionate people hung on his eloquent lips!

"Oh! if this sacred office, if the constant handling of things divine, if hours of study spent over the word of God, if frequent scenes of death with their most awful and sobering solemnities, if the irremediable ruin into which degradation from the holy office plunges a man and his house with him, if the unspeakable heinousness of this sin in one who held the post of a sentinel and was charged with the care of souls—if these do not fortify and fence us against the temptations of the flesh, then, in the name of God, 'let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.'"

"Subjects of this kind," writes Lord Kames, in his "Elements of Criticism," "are of all the fittest for tragedy;" and he supposes a case in which a virtuous man has drawn on himself a great misfortune by a fault incident to human nature. The remorse which

this virtuous man (not Mr. Lewis), naturally feels, aggravates his distress and enhances our pity. We cannot but censure his conduct, but the indignation is slight, as scarcely to be felt in the mixture with pity. In the case of the Reverend Richard Lewis the process is exactly reversed. Our indignation at his stubborn impetuosity and reckless effrontery swallows up all other feelings, as Aaron's and did the rods of the Magicians.

We can thoroughly understand the motives which prompt his stiff-necked conduct, but we cannot for that reason consent to forgive it. He knows full well that disgraced as he is, and notorious as is his dishonor from Daas to Beersheba, he can never hope to regain the confidence and respect of his late congregation, without humble, heartfelt, and undisguised repentance. Yet, however, to all sense of shame, like Pharaoh he has hardened his heart. Hardless of the welfare of the church, regardless of the feelings of his family, and utterly devoid of self-respect, the abhorrent delinquent is, abjectly content to brave public odium, and be pointed at by the finger of public scorn, so long as he can retain his Rectory. His Rectory, but not his congregation; two hundred and thirty of whom, comprising, with a few exceptions, all the most respectable, intelligent and influential members, petitioned against him at a moment's notice, and individually recorded their indignation at his wickedness.

And is there one among us who envies him his self-created position? God forbid! Clear above the storm of his passions "the still small voice" of conscience is doubtless still heard. The never-dying worm of remorse is doubtless now gnawing at his heart. The humblest individual who toils for a livelihood, ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, but honest, may be said when compared with the Rev. Richard Lewis, to revel in an existence of consummate bliss.

"Judge not that ye be not judged," VII. Mat. 1. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone." VIII. John 7. "Charity suffereth long and is kind," is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil. I. Corin. XIII. 4, 5. These and other kindred texts are sentences devoutly to be remembered.

We quote them reverently, believing them implicitly, and appreciating intensely the spirit that breathes through them. But we have heard them triumphantly babbled by the few partisans of the opinionated Rector, and we are at a loss to conceive how, in lifting up about voices to protest in self-defence, against the proved guilt and substantiated hypocrisy of a wily pastor, his late Congregation are violating in the smallest degree, the spirit of Christianity, or in fact doing anything but discharging a solemn duty. There are times, and this is one of them, when silence would imply approval, and when express condemnation becomes an imperious necessity.

Even the Bishop of Toronto characterizes his conduct by the same language, in the Bishop's letter on page 14, where it is said that a

But there are other texts, which we believe to be applicable to the case. "If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him: and if he repent, forgive him." And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him."—XVII. Luke 3, 4.

Note well the condition on which forgiveness is to be shown. "If he repent." In an early stage of these unhappy proceedings, had the Rev. Mr. Lewis followed the honorable advice of one of the older members of his Congregation, and offered to the families aggrieved a full explanation of his unclerical conduct: guilty as he was, had he turned saying, I repent, he would most assuredly have been forgiven in a Christian spirit; the scandal now brought on the Church might have been spared; and the name of an unworthy minister of Christ's Gospel would not have been, as it now is, a by-word and a reproach.

Surely the words, which we are about to quote, by a strange coincidence run parallel with the case. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone: if he shall hear thee, then thou hast gained thy brother." But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man, and a publican."—XVIII. Mat. 18, 16, 17. The Reverend gentleman was guilty of grievous trespass. He was told of his faults, but refused to hear those who told him. Every word was then clearly established against him, in the mouth of two or three witnesses. His offences were told to the Church. He neglected to hear the Church, and set his Bishop at defiance. He is accordingly become unto us "as an heathen man, and a publican." And he will remain so.

Let us calmly review the whole case from the beginning. The appointment of the Reverend Richard Lewis, to the incumbency of the Parish of Prescott, appeared at first to give satisfaction. He was well received wherever he visited, and for some time nothing occurred to disturb the harmonious feeling that existed. There were, however, a few families with whom he seemed to be more particularly intimate, and by whom he was most cordially welcomed; who had conceived the highest opinion of his character as a Christian Pastor, who entertained for him a deep feeling of esteem, and naturally placed the most implicit confidence in his sincerity and integrity. Happy would it have been, had such a desirable state of things continued! By degrees, however, reports began to

We have before us an extract from a New York paper, in which the case is detailed in an article headed, "An Affectionate Shepherd." Even the Liverpool Press has commented on the scandal; while the principal journals of Montreal, Quebec, Toronto and the smaller towns, have almost all alluded to it, and a ballad entitled, "Our Ambitious Rector," has been extensively circulated.

be circulated, involving serious charges against the Rector in regard to his conduct towards two ladies, members of the above-mentioned families. One was married, Mrs. B.; the other, unmarried, Miss W.; and both ladies are possessed of considerable personal attractions. His attentions to Miss W. had been noticed on many different occasions as being very marked, and certainly far beyond what was required by ordinary courtesy; but being a married man and a clergyman, he could not be supposed to mean anything serious, and many, who had noticed his manner to her, remarked that *his devotion appeared very ridiculous, coming as it did from a middle-aged, married clergyman*. He was frequently seen driving with the young lady, and visited her house so often, three or four times a week, that his extreme civility could not fail to be observed, and a gentleman swore at the preliminary investigation that he had told his wife that some trouble would assuredly arise from this pertinacious visiting.

When, therefore, it was understood that the reports which prevailed, were founded on *complaints of his conduct made by those very families, who had been among his warmest friends*, people began to think that his attentions to Miss W. must have had a latent meaning, though exhibited merely as those of excessive politeness to the member of a family from whom he had received so much kindness.

The scandal at length became so great, and caused so much disgust and indignation, that it was generally felt that an enquiry ought to be instituted into the conduct of the Reverend gentleman by competent authority. A letter was accordingly written by the Church Wardens to the Bishop of Toronto, accompanied by documents from the parties aggrieved, in explanation and support of the charges, praying his Lordship to cause such steps to be taken, as the case might seem to demand. The Bishop considered the charges so grave that he appointed a Committee of enquiry, consisting of four Clergymen and one Layman, all gentlemen of high standing and repute. We subjoin their names:—

Venerable Alexander N. Bethune, D.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of York; Rev. E. Jukes Boswell, D.C.L., Morrisburgh; Rev. H. J. Grasett, Toronto; Rev. John Wilson, Grafton; J. Cookburn, Esq., Cobourg.

In pursuance of his Lordship's instructions these gentlemen assembled at Prescott, and formed themselves into a Court of Enquiry, before which the several parties were summoned to appear. Previous to this time, however, when his trial was inevitable, Mr. Lewis issued the following circular:

To the Members of the United Church of England and Ireland, worshipping at St. John's Church.

DEAR BRETHREN,—For reasons that I need not mention, I have hitherto refrained from taking any notice of charges, which are ma-

AND HIS LATE CONGREGATION.

9

icious and false, against my character, which have obtained circulation in this Parish.

I have now to request you as Christian men, to withhold your verdict in this matter until the Bishop of the Diocese shall have legally investigated the charges, and witnesses shall be cross-examined on oath.

I have this day written to his Lordship begging as a favor that no unnecessary delay shall take place, in bringing the investigation to completion.

I remain, dear Brethren, Yours truly.

R. LEWIS, Rector.

Prescott, May 26th, 1860.

There is nothing very remarkable about this document. It consists of three sentences. Owing, probably, to his nervousness, which we can easily understand, the arrangement of the first sentence, seems to be rather faulty. But this by the way. The second sentence requests his Congregation "to withhold their verdict until, &c., &c." His Congregation did so: the witnesses were cross-examined on oath, the Bishop pronounced his verdict, and Mr. Lewis now quarrels with his Congregation because they accept this decision, and accuses them of persecuting him, as if it were not his own vile conduct which had caused all the trouble. The third sentence involves an artifice. Driven into a corner, and with no visible means of escape, Mr. Lewis assumes a frank air of innocence, and explains to his Congregation how extremely anxious he is that there should be no "unnecessary delay," as if he really believed that his acquittal was a certainty, and considered it a great misfortune to lie under even momentary suspicion.

We all know the result of the Court of Enquiry. Mr. Lewis had the fairest possible chance. He was represented by two legal gentlemen, one of them his brother, who we think was heartily ashamed of the case. It is needless to add that, after being subjected in open court to the most rigid cross-examination, the two ladies fully substantiated the charges. At the conclusion of the Enquiry, the Chairman of the Commission said: "We are unanimously of opinion that there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence against the Rev Richard Lewis to warrant us in remanding him for trial to the Bishop's Court at Toronto." Such was the verdict at the preliminary investigation, and a more righteous one was perhaps never pronounced. Not a link was wanting in the chain of evidence, and the Rector's guilt was conclusively proved.

When any important trial is pending, it is usual for the Press to abstain from commenting on the case. Contrary, however, to the established etiquette of journalism, an article now appeared in the 17th number of the *Canadian Church Press*, in which an ignorant and flippant writer exhibited strange notions of morality, and a stranger disregard for truth. It may be remarked that this *Canadian Church Press*, which had been very sickly from its birth, died

(as was to be expected), with the number which contained so scandalous an article; and it is to be hoped that the reckless author of those paragraphs, will abstain in future from obtruding upon public notice the pointless productions of his goose quill:

As the whole composition is a specimen of the smooth-tongued mendacity of Mr. Lewis's few supporters, we feel tempted to give some extracts, referring our readers for further information to the *Canadian Church Press*, of September 12th, 1860.

He writes: "A commission of four clergymen sat in public with all the scandal-mongers of the place present, to institute an inquiry whether there was *prima facie* evidence to present a clergyman for trial." We would ask how this reporter for the defunct *Church Press* dared to make so sweeping an assertion. The inquiry being a public one, many ladies and gentlemen, who then belonged to Mr. Lewis's congregation, certainly attended the Court. In a case so grave, and when the character of their Minister was at stake, they chose rather to hear the facts for themselves, and see the witnesses cross-examined, than to trust to the vague babblings of rumor for an account of the proceedings. But are these ladies and gentlemen, who were then present from a laudable desire of ascertaining the facts, to be therefore termed scandal-mongers by a disingenuous penny-a-liner? He continues, "*we do not wish to prejudice a case which must, it seems, come to a formal trial; but inasmuch &c., &c.*" and he then proceeds to give at length a *false account* of the whole matter, with the transparent intention of awaking public sympathy in favor of the clerical transgressor. Is this fair play? Is this conduct straightforward or impartial? Is it not rather insidious, one sided, and positively dishonest?

Take the following as a specimen of the writer's candor: "In answer to questions from a commissioner, the young lady swore that the kissing was done playfully, and that the defendant meant nothing morally wrong in his proposal to her." This is an infamous attempt to deceive the public on a most important point. We are fortunately able to expose this dissimulation, and present to our readers, in order to refute the falsehood, such portions of the young lady's affidavit as bear upon that part of the case:

"A short time previous to the 4th of January last, while the Reverend Mr. Lewis of Prescott, was driving me out, he took the liberty of kissing me, and intimated that he had an affection for me, and if nothing were in the way, would make me his wife. From the high opinion I had of my Rector, I considered he might not have meant any harm, and treated it accordingly. During a subsequent drive and still before the 4th of January, he repeated the liberty he had formerly taken, and referred to the same idea as intimated before. I did not reply, for then I considered him in earnest, and his motive wicked. About the 4th of January I left for Brockville; Mr. Lewis met me at the Prescott station, but I remained in company of my Father. On the following day Mr.

Lew
vate
prio
for
ma
S
men
To
lady
limi
wou
and
Whi
rival
ping
I w
this
ably
Lew
emin
that
coul
hom
adv
been
In
Cour
have
chan
perf
W
exist
iniqu
serv
poun
with
of th
B
fact
shou
you
sw
scand
T
danc
prop
he h
mad

Lewis followed me to Brockville, and came to see me at the private residence of Mr. B., (at whose house I was visiting), and there *privately demanded of me if I would not promise to wait one year for him, and perhaps he would be free then, and would then marry me. The proposition I considered heinous and at once resented it.*

Such is the affidavit of the young lady; but how does this statement square with the assertion of the writer in the *Church Press*? To expose the deception still more fully, we copy part of the young lady's evidence on oath, as taken down from her lips at the preliminary enquiry: "Mr. Lewis asked me on one occasion, if I would wait a year for him, and that perhaps he would then be free, and would marry me. This was before I saw him in Brockville. While I was there, he called on me. It was the day after my arrival. *He was a stranger to Mr. B.,* at whose house I was stopping, but said he had seen Miss B. once before, at Perth I think. I was alone with Mr. Lewis a little time before dinner. During this time he again urged me to wait a year for him, and that probably he would then be free to marry me. He told me that Mrs. Lewis had been to Toronto, and while there had consulted several eminent physicians; and that they had all expressed their surprise that she was alive, and that from the nature of her disease, she could not live a year. *That closed the intimacy.* When I came home I told my cousin what Mr. Lewis had said to me. She advised me to tell my father all that had happened. . . . *I have not been in his company since. I avoided him after that.*"

In an after part of the evidence, in answer to a question from the Court, the young lady said, "I thought that his first proposal might have been made in playfulness; but the proposal at Brockville changed my opinion. I consider that the second proposal was *perfectly serious, and that he meant what he said.*"

We cannot imagine how evidence more damning can possibly exist; nor are we acquainted with a case more heartless and iniquitous. We know that, as Robert Hall, we think, has observed, the mind of the bigot is like the eye; the more light we pour upon it, the more it contracts; but surely there is no bigot with a mind so contracted as to refuse assent to the conclusiveness of this testimony.

But, continues the writer in the *Church Press*, with clumsy facetiousness, "If the clergyman had only been good-natured, we should have heard nothing of this scandal; but when he *cut the young lady, and said naughty things about her*, she proceeds to swear that he had kissed her, to his own great detriment, and the scandal of the church."

The whole of this statement is a wanton falsehood. The evidence on the trial distinctly proves, that it was Miss W. who very properly cut Mr. Lewis; and it was after this had taken place, and he had complained of it in strong terms to Mrs. B. that he suddenly made the discovery, now for the first time, that Miss W. was a

dangerous character, and began, as the penny-a-liner has it, "to say naughty things about her," well knowing that the exposure of his wickedness was destined soon to take place.

After this, what becomes of the assertion of the *Church Press* that Miss W. "is actuated by a feeling of *unrequited affection*?" Can we conceive a more ridiculous defence for Mr. Lewis, or an insinuation more outrageous against Miss W.? We give the final paragraph of the writer, and leave him to his fate: "In the present case if all the charges be substantiated, the severest penalty can be only an *admonition and censure from the Bishop of the Diocese*." And this is the man, whom we before quoted as saying, "we do not wish to *prejudice* a case, which must, it seems, come to a formal trial." May we ask what he is now doing? Not only does he entertain a *prejudice* in Mr. Lewis's favor; in other words, not only does he hold an opinion formed without due examination of the facts and arguments which are necessary to an impartial determination, (for this is the meaning of the word *prejudice*), but he has actually *prejudicated*, that is, pronounced final judgment in a cause, before that cause has been heard. We again charge this writer with dishonest partisanship, and draw attention to the careless air of *sans froid* with which he speaks of "only an admonition and censure from the Bishop," as if grave charges against a clergyman were simply a joke, and Episcopal condemnation a mere *bagatelle*.

Mr. Lewis was tried before the Court at Toronto, and the Bishop pronounced his judgment, which we give in *extenso*:

IN THE COURT OF THE BISHOP OF TORONTO.

In the case of *The Rev. Richard Lewis*, Judgment.

In this case, articles have been exhibited against the defendant, charging him with impropriety of conduct in his clerical office, in having on several occasions taken improper liberties with a young lady, one of his Parishioners, by kissing her; and with having used language both to her, and of her to others, calculated to defame and disparage her; and also, in reference to her, having falsely and maliciously made statements tending to the disquiet of another family, with whom the young lady was on intimate terms.

To these articles, defendant has put in a general denial of their truth; the evidence that has been given has been all on the side of the complainants; the defendant having stated that he was unable to procure the attendance of some witnesses, but one witness was present, whose testimony his counsel however did not consider material, and the case remains to be adjudged upon the testimony adduced by the complainant alone.

This evidence, in my judgment, makes out a case of great levity and frivolity on the part of the defendant. He is proved to be married, yet he is very frequently in the company of the young

lady, whose father is the complainant, and on various occasions he is shown to have used the improper liberty charged against him, of kissing her, and has otherwise acted towards her, in his constant visits to her home, and his following her to Brockville, in a manner unbecoming a clergyman and calculated to bring scandal upon the church. It is quite true that in the course of these proceedings, the young lady herself is not free from blame, but has exhibited by her own admission a want of that maidenly delicacy and reserve which I should have expected from a young lady in her rank of life, but she is evidently so much younger than the defendant, and he was placed in such a position towards her, as her spiritual adviser, that he should have been himself the person to warn her against lightness of conduct; instead of leading her to the commission of acts, for which he can offer no excuse, much less justification.

I consider also that his remarks to her, and about her as set forth in the second and third articles, were unbecoming and scandalous, and although the words charged in the third article cannot all be pronounced false, yet the motive for making use of them cannot I fear be attributed to any desire to promote good will among the parishioners, or for any object that I can declare praiseworthy.

Under all the circumstances of the case, I pronounce that the articles are proved, with the exception of the words false and malicious as applied to the first part of the words charged in the third article; and I admonish Mr. Lewis to abstain from offending in like manner in future, I condemn him in the costs of these proceedings, and if those costs are not paid in one calendar month from this date, I adjudge him to be suspended, *ab officio et beneficio*, until these costs are paid.

[Signed]

JOHN TORONTO.

Dated, 29th September, 1860.

Before the Judgment of the Court was pronounced, Mr. Lewis had declared to one of the Church Wardens, that if he were condemned he would immediately quit the Parish. He may retract, but he cannot disclaim, an assurance so positive. Beyond all cavil or doubt he was condemned; nevertheless he evaded his promise and repudiated his pledged word, (though not for the first time*) and

* The following document needs no comment:—

PERCOTT, C. W., November 3rd, 1860.

The Building Committee, appointed by the Congregation of the Episcopal Church of St. John at Percott, C. W., for the purpose of carrying out the desire of the Rector in the collection of subscriptions for erecting a new Church, found it necessary to raise money, from time to time, in order to meet the current expenses as the work proceeded, until the amounts subscribed by the members of the Congregation should become due. For this purpose the Committee were compelled to draw notes, some of which were discounted at the Commercial Bank. The Rev. R. Lewis, as Chairman, signed these notes at first, with the other members of the Committee. One of these notes (discounted by the Commercial Bank) for \$1600, fell due on the 30th of May, 1860, which it was necessary to renew. A renewal note was accordingly made for that purpose and

still remains the Incumbent, we may add, the *incubus* of Prescott. There was considerable bluster at first on the part of his few adherents. Some, vexed with the inevitable result, asserted with unreasoning bigotry that the Venerable Bishop was in his dotage, and his decision therefore unimportant. All were certain of one thing at least, that the Rector was determined never to pay the costs, and would appeal forthwith to the Privy Council. We, who had penetrated the nature of the man, knew that these assertions were mere idle vapouring. The condemned offender was far too astute to be guilty of any such blunders. In due time he of course discharged all legal costs which were imposed upon him, and has often since, we doubt not, laughed quietly to himself at having escaped so cheaply after conduct so disgraceful.

In the face of that Judgment, there are many who have felt, that the Defendant was not punished with a rigor proportioned to his guilt. There are many who have regretted the tender-heartedness of the Bishop, and who, duly respecting him for his clement disposition, still feel that his lenity was, in the present instance, carried to a faulty extreme, or rather misplaced altogether. Tenderness to the wolf is cruelty to the flock, and it may be asked for what purpose crooks and croziers are designed, if not to defend our folds against such ruthless depredators as the Reverend Richard Lewis? On this point we have to offer a few words of explanation. We are enabled to state on indubitable authority, the reason why the Judgment was apparently so lenient, considering the gravity of the charges substantiated. It was intimated to the Bishop by some friends of the accused, and doubtless at his suggestion, that if the Judgment were as mild as the nature of the case would admit, he would immediately vacate his Incumbency. In confirmation of the truth of this fact, we lay before our readers the following letter from the venerable Bishop of Toronto; bespeaking for it from all, but especially from the Reverend Richard Lewis, the attentive consideration which it undoubtedly deserves:—

TORONTO, 17th October, 1860.

CARLETON.—I have to acknowledge two communications from you. The first, dated 8th October, enclosing a memorial signed by the principal members of the Church of England, in Prescott; and the second, dated 15th inst, by which I am made aware of the difficulties in which your Parish has been involved by the Empru-

signed by the Committee, and was presented to the Rev. R. Lewis for his signature by Mr. Lister, the Teller of the Commercial Bank, but Mr. Lewis positively refused to sign it, thus repudiating his share of the responsibility previously assumed, and leaving it to be borne by the rest of the Committee.

I hereby and declare the above to be a true statement.

FUIFORD B. FEILDE, Sec'y-Treasurer.

I certify that I presented at maturity the above mentioned note of the "Building Committee," for the purpose of obtaining Mr. Lewis' signature, to which he refused, "I will not sign it."

F. A. W. LISTER, Teller.

dent conduct of your Incumbent. And, indeed I am not surprised when I consider the *reckless proceedings* of the Rev. Richard Lewis, since his trial.

The decision of the Court, was as lenient as the subject would admit, and given in the hope that the Rev. Richard Lewis would see this, and *retire from the Parish* on finding that he could be no longer of any use in his profession, and if after a time, he shewed by his *improved conduct and hearty repentance*, that he might again be *safely* entrusted with another charge, I should, in such case, have assisted in giving him another mission. But so far from adopting this course, which is almost universally followed—he seems to *glory in his shame*, and to put the Bishop and his late Congregation to defiance. The case being new in this country, I am not prepared to say what the future proceedings should be, but it is only a question of time, and doubtless on a full enquiry we shall find a remedy for *so monstrous an evil*.

In the meantime, I recommend peace and quietness, for such a state of things cannot continue long.

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,

Yours faithfully,

JOHN TORONTO.

J. S. MERWIN and C. SHAVER, Esqrs.

With a document such as this on our side, we might fearlessly close the case, and secure from a candid public a unanimous verdict against the defendant. But it will scarcely be believed that there actually exist partisans of Mr. Lewis, who have declined to read, and probably never will read, either the Judgment of the Court or this important letter from the Bishop. We ask, is this bigotry, or is it not? Is it fair to listen to the sophistical evasions of Mr. Lewis, and to refuse to read the frank statements of his Bishop?

We must again insist upon a point which we have previously noticed. Mr. Lewis in his circular simply requested us "to withhold our verdict until the Bishop of the Diocese shall have legally investigated the charges." We withheld *our* verdict accordingly until the Bishop pronounced *his*. The decision was, that Mr. Lewis had been proved guilty of conduct, "unbecoming a clergyman, and tending to bring scandal on the Church."

And are we now to be blamed by Mr. Lewis for accepting this verdict? are the more intelligent and self-respecting members of his congregation, who from a strong sense of duty will no longer countenance his ministrations, to be charged therefore with persecuting a maligned individual? Away with such unreasoning favoritism! we protest against such cant! As we remarked before, it is not the cowl which makes the monk. A clergyman like a layman is liable to trespass, and should not be upheld and defended simply *because he is a clergyman*. Have the few who still listen to the sermons of Mr. Lewis: sermons, which must be so impressive,

because they are so sincere; have the few, who are blindly content to regard his actions as pure, merely because his pulpit discourses are of course puritanically pure; have these few persons, we say, more efficient means of ascertaining the truth in this case, than the Bishop who had the affidavits &c., of the ladies before him, full notes of the preliminary enquiry, and ample opportunities for thoroughly sifting the evidence? If so, let the public have the benefit of the hitherto suppressed facts, which will ensure the Rector a triumphant acquittal; let his late congregation enjoy the satisfaction of making the *amende honorable*, and let us all do justice, though at the eleventh hour, to the lamb-like innocence of a persecuted saint!

But unfortunately for the Rector's cause, there are no facts suppressed; the proofs of his guilt cannot fairly be disputed. In the language of the Bishop, "he can offer no excuse," he can plead no justification. Under these grave circumstances, what can possibly be the nature of his defence? With an effrontery almost unparalleled, he roundly asserts that the whole charges against him are utterly without foundation; that, as the liberties taken with Miss W. rest solely upon her testimony, and as he denies them *in toto*, they cannot be said to be proved, &c. &c. But surely if the testimony of Miss W. is confirmed by strong corroborative evidence, it cannot but be accepted by the public; and we should much like to know what other direct evidence on certain points can reasonably be expected to exist? A wily intriguer like Mr. Lewis is not likely to have inflicted his unorthodox kisses in presence of an astonished crowd. Emphatically, not! His Rectorial billing and cooing were restricted (as was natural, and as will be seen in the evidence) to the secure privacy of a covered buggy. It is as true now, as it was eighteen hundred years ago, "men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

This, then, is the defence: "To these articles the defendant has put in a *general denial* of their truth." (Judgment of the court.) Truly, a most satisfactory defence, and one not involving any elaborate preparation! But it has not even the merit of originality; inasmuch as it has been unsuccessfully adopted by hundreds of rogues at every police-court in Canada, and moreover adopted, often with a much greater show of probability, when there has not been one tenth of the strong circumstantial evidence that happily exists in the present case. If, then, this defence satisfies the Rector, it decidedly does not his late congregation. The charges against him are not general, but specific, and backed in every particular by distinct proof. The defence, to be valid, should be of a corresponding nature. This it can never be.

The public will not be hoodwinked. They wish to be accurately informed on several material points. They want to know, whether it was by accident or by design, that the Rev. Richard Lewis chose as the objects of his special visitations, two ladies, young and

pretty, in preference to other females, equally members of his Congregation, but of unpleasing exterior, or unseductive antiquity.— They want to be informed by what motives he was actuated, when, on different occasions, he expressed a strong wish to be allowed to mesmerize each of these two ladies. They want to be informed why he, a married clergyman, visited one of these ladies three or four times a week, and once when her father was away from home, every day in the week. They want him to explain why he followed her to Brockville, and to declare why, unless it was to force his attentions upon her, he visited at the house of a gentleman, her host, to whom he was personally unknown. They want him to state how it was he called on Miss W. then, and a few days after this visit made the notable discovery that she was a dangerous character, unless it was because she had refused to accede to his vile proposals, which she declares in her affidavit “she resented as heinous.” From the numberless visits he had paid Miss W. he certainly, if any one, had enjoyed opportunities of thoroughly learning her character; why then had he always hitherto treated her with marked deference, and in fact uncalled for courtesy, and how comes it that he *now*, suddenly and for the first time, finds out that he has been associating with a dangerous character? The reason is transparent. That visit at Brockville, from the immoral nature of his advances, “closed the intimacy,” as Miss W. has sworn. Her eyes were at length opened to the heartless designs of the Rector, and he shrewdly surmised that an exposure was at hand. How can he obviate the effect of her revelations? By what means throw dust in the eyes of the public? An idea flashes across his scheming brain. Fiendish and malicious as it is, it may impose, he calculates, on the credulous. He is aware that in the estimation of many weak-minded individuals, it is difficult beyond measure, for a clergyman to fall into transgression. This fact is in his favor; he will of course contradict all charges against himself, and if in addition to this denial, he can insidiously bring a counter-accusation against the young lady with even the faintest shadow of probability, his innocence may perhaps be credited by some few of the least discerning. Artfully then, and with unsurpassed treachery, he commences to blacken her character. He goes immediately to a lady, and tries to awake in her a feeling of jealousy against Miss W. He tells her that she is a simple-minded woman not to perceive her husband’s motives in encouraging an intimacy with Miss W. He insinuates, he suggests, he pities, he advises, he behaves in fact with an ingenuity of low cunning, which might easily have imposed upon a weak or jealously disposed woman. But all in vain; as we shall see from the evidence we are about to quote:

Fanny Amelia B. sworn: “Has known the defendant the Rev. Richard Lewis, over a year. He is a married man but has no children. Suppose him to be between forty and fifty years of age. Should think that Mrs. Lewis was over forty. Witness is a con-

THE RECTOR OF PRESCOTT

armed member of the Church, but has never taken the Sacrament. Was a regular attendant upon the services of the Church until the beginning of this year (1860). Rev. Mr. Lewis was in the habit of calling at witness's house frequently until last winter. During his visits he never but once spoke of subjects connected with religion—then it was just before the Bishop's visitation last summer, when witness was to be confirmed. The defendant's conversation was generally about topics connected with the town gossip. He spoke frequently of the color and expression of eyes. He called on me a few days previous to Good Friday, and asked me what I had been saying to Miss W. about him. He said that she had cut him in the street. He was apparently much agitated. I tried to evade his question by saying that perhaps she had not seen him, she being near-sighted. He said that she had seen him perfectly well. He appeared to be very anxious to know what I had said to Miss W. Miss W. had just been at my house. He called again on Good Friday, but I was not at home. He called next on Easter Eve about 4 o'clock, p.m. He was shown into the parlor, and I was called down, and was with him alone. There are two doors leading into the room. Both were open. He wished me to allow him to close them, and said some one might hear what he said. I declined to allow him to do so, and told him that I would not permit him to say what others might not hear. I sat near one of the doors. He told me that the whole town pitied me, and asked me if I did not mistrust an improper intimacy between my husband and Miss W. I told him that I certainly did not; that I had every confidence in my husband and Miss W.; that she was an old friend of mine, and that we had been school-mates. He told me that I was a simple minded woman not to perceive my husband's motives in encouraging the intimacy between myself and Miss W. That Miss W. came frequently to my house to answer my husband's purposes. I told him that he was no friend of mine thus to try to embitter me against my husband. He assured me that he was my friend, and that it was for that reason he told me this. He asked me whether Miss W. came to see me, when she called at my house. I answered him that of course she did. He said that I was entirely mistaken; that it was my husband she came to see and not me. I told him that I knew Miss W. and her motives far better than he did, and that I should be very sorry to doubt her sincerity. He said that Miss W. was a dangerous character, and that I must beware of her. He told me that my husband had been out riding with her after 11 o'clock at night—that there should be a boy sent out to ride behind, to hear and see what was going on. I told him that Miss W. was to be married to Mr. C. He said he pitied the man who married her. I told him that I would tell Miss W. what he had been saying about her. He begged me not to do so, until he had had another interview. I was always afraid of Mr. Lewis, and invariably sat near

the door when he called at my house. Up to that time he had visited on an average once a week, sometimes oftener. During one of his visits he asked permission to mesmerize me. I said that I had never been mesmerized, and would on no account allow it.

To the Reverend Dr. Boswell. "I do not think that it was said jestingly. I looked upon Mr. Lewis as the minister of my Church, and in that light could hardly bring myself to think that he meant anything wrong in his conversations. I certainly never gave him any encouragement to speak to me in this manner. I always repeated Mr. Lewis's conversations to my husband immediately after they had taken place. My husband several times told me that I must be mistaken, and that I had probably misunderstood Mr. Lewis. During one of Mr. Lewis's visits, the conversation turned upon fractious horses, and I told him of having been out driving with my husband a few days before, with a colt my husband owns and sometimes drives. The colt became unmanageable when backing out of the yard of a house, where my husband had been calling, and backed the cutter against a waggon, and very nearly injured us both. Mr. Lewis asked me whether I did not think that my husband had done this intentionally to injure me. I told him that not the slightest suspicion of the kind had ever entered my mind, and that it was highly improper in him to try and excite me against my husband, that I loved my husband, and I believed he loved me. He said that my husband did not love me, and that it was the talk of the town that he was not attentive enough to me. Mr. Lewis asked me several times to go driving with him to Maitland or elsewhere; but I always declined, and told him that we had several horses in our own stable, and that I could go driving whenever I chose."

Such is the evidence of Mrs. B. at the preliminary enquiry. It corresponds in every particular with her *affidavit* made some time previously. We make an extract from the *affidavit* on the mesmerism part of the business. "During one of his visits, while alone in the room with me, Mr. Lewis asked me if I had ever been mesmerized. I replied, no, that no one ever did, or could mesmerize me. He requested me to let him try, that he thought he could, and that when he got me asleep he would wake me again; to which I again emphatically refused." Here is a dilemma, with two very formidable horns. Either the *affidavit* of Mrs. B. is true, or it is not. If we believe it, as we certainly do, what on earth are we to think of this unclerical conduct on the part of Mr. Lewis? If we do not believe it, we are driven to suppose, either that Mrs. B. dreamt all this, or that she has deliberately perjured herself and joined in a foul conspiracy to blast the character of an innocent clergyman, whom she has apparently no motive for injuring. We appeal to the public, which of these two theories seems the more probable.

We subjoin such portion of Miss W.'s evidence as bears directly on the question at issue.

Mary Louisa W. sworn:—"I reside in Prescott, and am a member of the Church of England. I know the Reverend Richard Lewis—he visited at my father's house very frequently during the fall and winter of 1859 and 1860; as often as three times a week, and one week when my father was from home, Mr. Lewis came every day. I went out riding with Mr. Lewis very often, at his request. When he called at our house he asked for my mother, but he has told me to come into the room although not asked for. His conversation was generally about ladies, their dress, their eyes, &c. He used to read poetry to us, and sometimes repeated it from memory. It was generally from Byron, Mrs. Hemans, and Moore. The poetry was almost always about love: I do not remember his ever speaking on religion. I went on the cars to Brockville to make a visit. My father accompanied me to the station to see me off. Mr. Lewis was also at the station. The cars were behind their time, and my father and myself returned home. Mr. Lewis left the station at the same time, and when we returned in time for the train we found Mr. Lewis there again. I think he came to see me off. He asked me where I was going. I told him I was going to stay at Brockville at Mr. B.'s. He then asked me where Mr. B. lived." We here omit the young lady's account of the Brockville visit: as we have given it on a previous page. In another part of the evidence Miss W. says; "I went with him in the Fall in a covered buggy to Johnstown. I had on a thick veil. He desired me to raise my veil, and said that if I did not do so, he would kiss me. I did not raise my veil, and he kissed me through it." (Here again is a dilemma, but we think that the young lady selected the proper alternative. She was certain to be kissed whether she raised her veil, or not: but the kisses administered through a thick veil were probably less nauseating than they would otherwise have been. We continue our extracts.) "Mr. Lewis requested me to wear a black veil when I went driving with him, that people might think it was Mrs. Lewis. He has kissed me more than once. He had a kind of fascinating* influence over me whether present or absent. He wanted to mesmerize me, and on one occasion when driving in a

* Much capital has been made by Mr. Lewis and his friends out of these few simple words uttered on the spur of the moment by Miss W. during her evidence. We have not hesitated to repeat them here, inasmuch as we conscientiously believe that they do not contain any damaging admission. Brow-beaten by smart lawyers, and stared at by a multitude of eyes, a young lady could not choose her terms as nicely as she might desire. Moreover everyone knows how difficult it is to define accurately any mental emotion. The whole difficulty lies in the use of the word *fascinated*, which is what logicians call a 'vox ambigua'. By this term Miss W. did not mean that she was pleasingly affected by Mr. Lewis: such a notion is physically improbable: but that she was troubled in his presence by an uneasy and confused sensation—which sensation existed in a minor degree even in his absence, if anything chanced to recall his image to her mind. It is difficult to define the feeling, but it is easy enough to understand it. An uneasy

covered conveyance attempted to do so. He commenced to stare in my eyes, and continued to do so for about five minutes. I turned away my head from him. I never on any occasion went driving with Mr. Lewis unless at his request."

We might submit to our readers other portions of the evidence, but enough testimony has been adduced, and we are weary of the case. Nevertheless we cannot conclude without reference to one more particular, viz: the evidence on the side of the Defendant.—He has made a great clamor about this; but after all what was it—what was its value? What hindered him from producing it all, such as it was, before the five commissioners at the preliminary enquiry. He indeed brought forward one witness, his own servant; but what did she prove? Simply that she had a treacherous memory as to certain facts, which several clergymen, then present, could have proved if they had wished. Mr. Lewis dares not contradict this. Again, why was his wife's sister taken to Toronto and after all not examined for the defence? Assuredly because her evidence was not worth a straw, as she would only tell what she knew, and had scruples about telling falsehoods, which appear not to have troubled her reverend brother-in-law!

Let us give a brief history of one of his important witnesses.—Catherine McPhail, once a servant of Mrs. B. was subpoenaed from Glengarry, on behalf of Mr. Lewis. A sum of eighteen dollars was given her for her expenses to Toronto. She came to Prescott, and was examined as to the amount of her evidence by some legal advisers of the Rector. "What do you know against Miss W.?" was the first question. "Nothing at all," was the prompt reply, "Miss W. always behaved herself like a perfect lady, when I saw her." "What do you know of this matter of Mr. Lewis?" "All that I know about Mr. Lewis," replied the girl, "is this: Mrs. B. gave me orders if Mr. Lewis called again, never to let him in."—The lawyers looked blank and opined that this witness would not do to go to Toronto. They told her so accordingly, and demanded back the money which had been given her. "No," said the canny Catherine, "you have subpoenaed me from Glengarry and brought me here to Prescott; I am perfectly willing to go to Toronto, and as it is not my fault that my evidence does not suit you, I will certainly keep the money." The lawyers, in their zeal to economize for their client, coaxed and wheedled, bullied

sensation somewhat akin to it was experienced by Mrs. B.; "I was always afraid of Mr. Lewis" she says, "and invariably sat near the door when he called."

Dr Andrew Smith in his excellent work on "Reptilia" writes as follows: "Whatever may be said in ridicule of fascination, it is nevertheless true that birds, and even quadrupeds, are, under certain circumstances, unable to retire from the presence of certain of their enemies. This I have often exemplified in the case of birds and snakes; and I have heard of instances in which antelopes have been so bewildered by the appearance of crocodiles, and by the grimaces and distortions they practised, as to be unable to fly or even move from the spot." Really, when we read of these snakes and crocodiles, and think of Mr. Lewis, we consider that Miss W. has had a lucky escape!

and blustered, and finally threatened her with the black-hole, and other tragical penalties. But their blandishments were in vain, and their threats unavailing. The inflexible young woman adhered doggedly to the dimes, and we are thus enabled to publish this veritable history of how the lawyers were nonplussed, and how the Reverend Richard Lewis lost about eighteen dollars, by the contumacy of one of those important witnesses, about whom he delights to vapour. It may be well to mention, in case this story be denied, that Catherine McPhail will at any time swear to these facts, either in Prescott or Toronto; provided of course that the Rev. Richard Lewis will again be so obliging as to pay all her expenses from Glengarry.

We had at one time intended, before concluding this pamphlet, to recapitulate briefly the principal points of the case. We believe, on looking back, that such a course is unnecessary. We felt it our duty to explain the circumstances that tended to modify the judgment; but the evidence of the witnesses, and the letter from the Bishop need no additional comment on our part. Nothing, therefore, remains for us to do, except to offer a few words of good, sound, practical advice to that would-be martyr, the Rev. Richard Lewis. We are by no means certain that he will thank us for our kindness, but the ingratitude of the man will not alter the value of the suggestions.

Most earnestly, then, we recommend him no longer to trifle with his present position. He has been guilty of grievous offences; let him atone for them in an honorable spirit. The only reparation that he can offer to his Parishioners for all the trouble his misconduct has occasioned them, is to vacate his Incumbency without delay. Let him carefully compose a farewell sermon, and the largest Congregation that ever he addressed will assemble to listen to it in delighted convention. Should he afterwards accept another mission, the following hints are well worthy of his adoption:

Let him pay strict attention to some words of St. Paul, which he appears rather strangely to have overlooked or forgotten. Let him consult 1 Thess.: V, 12, and "abstain from all appearance of evil." In connection with this text, we commend to his notice a humble, but not despicable Chinese proverb, "In a cucumber-field do not stoop to tie your shoe, and under a plum-tree do not settle your cap on your head." Let him commit to memory certain passages from the Bible, rather than the amatory effusions of Byron and Moore. Let him not only commit them to memory, but *let him learn them well by heart*. The "Bard of Erin" may occasion him to trip, but the "sweet Psalmist of Israel" will preserve him from stumbling.

Meanwhile we select for his edification two verses from one of those books, which, according to the sixth Article, "the church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners." "Turn away thine eye from a beautiful woman, and look not on another's beauty;

for many have been deceived by the beauty of a woman ; for herewith love is kindled as a fire. Sit not at all with another man's wife, lest thy heart incline to her, and so through thy desire thou fall into destruction."—IX Ecclesiasticus, 8, 9.

Mr. Lewis is evidently troubled with what St. James calls "superfluity of naughtiness." Let him accordingly never thrust himself into the society of ladies, [whether maids, wives, or widows] unless he be accompanied by his better half. He will thus be less liable to fall into temptation ; for even where the spirit is willing, the flesh is weak. When a volcano gives proofs that its fires are but smouldering, some fierce eruption may at any time be expected. "Which things are an allegory."

Mr. Lewis, moreover, if he has any *clairvoyance*, will refrain from gratifying his *penchant* for mesmerism. Or if he will still attempt that non-sacerdotal art, let him electro-biologize his grandmother, or force the oldest female inhabitant into a state of coma. The most suspicious will then not mistrust his motives ; but let the youth and beauty of his lady-acquaintances be henceforth deemed secure from the magnetism of his stare, and the freedom of his manipulations. Finally, let him break himself, by a strong effort, of the unclerical trick of promiscuous kissing. It is an institution peculiar to the Turks or Mormons, but one not sanctioned by the Christian Church. Brigham Young is no model for an Episcopalian Clergyman.

We here lay down our pen, wearied with a painful duty. One thought alone has sustained us while writing : it was the inward conviction that truth is on our side. Thankfully, then, we call to mind some glorious words of the immortal Milton, which we commend to the earnest attention of our readers : "Let Truth and Falsehood grapple : who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter ? She needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings to make her victorious ; those are the shifts and defences that Error uses against her power."

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

The following "Letters to Churchmen," originally appeared in the *Prescott Conservative Messenger*:

No. I.

FELLOW CHURCHMEN.—What are we doing? Whither are we going? What is to be the end of our present condition? There is no use in trying to conceal the fact that our beloved Church in this town is losing ground daily. We all see it—we all feel it, and others see and feel it too. The story of our disgrace and our trouble has gone out through the length and breadth of the land. All friends and enemies—wherever a public journal is read, know of the shame which has come upon us. They know but little of what we have borne with—of the insult, the calumnies, to which we have patiently submitted. They see that we are at variance with our head, and our friends, who know no more, blame us—and our enemies glory over us. Is this state of things to continue? Are we content to remain, to all intents and purposes, without a Minister of the Gospel among us? Are we satisfied to be deprived for an indefinite time of free access to the sanctuary of God?—to do without public Baptism for our children?—to lie under a virtual sentence of excommunication? What if the hand of death should visit us—and some beloved one be taken away while the Church is in a state of *interdict*?

Is our beautiful Church, on which so much has been spent—the fruit of so many hopes and anxieties and labors, to be shut against us in its most solemn services? Must we give up all hopes of being again united as one body under a Minister whom we can respect and love, and despair of obtaining justice from the authorities of the Church? Or shall we, wronged, oppressed, slandered as we have been, quietly submit to recognize as God's Minister, him who has so grossly disgraced that sacred office: No! fellow Churchmen—in God's name, no! There is no reason why we should do either. We need not despair nor become impatient—to do either would be sinful. God is with us. Our reverend Bishop is with us—the sympathy of churchmen, wherever the truth is known, is with us. Let us take counsel together, and see what is best to be done in our present need.

No. II.

FELLOW CHURCHMEN.—We have taken a most important step—we have incurred a great responsibility, in withdrawing ourselves from the usual services of our Church—in refusing to attend the ministering of one who has been "set before us in spiritual things." Was this step a justifiable one? We think it was: We are confirmed in thinking so, by the words of sympathy and encouragement of our venerable Bishop himself. But it is a step which is liable to be misunderstood and sure to be misrepresented. And some among ourselves need to be taught the **REAL GROUNDS** on which those who have always been the firm supporters of the

Church and Her Ministers now feel that duty bids them for a time to act in apparent opposition. Personal feeling there is, or ought to be none, in such a matter. It is for the sake of the Church we are acting. It is as supporters of the principle of Episcopacy that we take our stand—determined that never in this Province shall a system grow up, such as has unhappily obtained ground in England, by which a Bishop may be defied by his clergy, and his hands rendered powerless to execute needful discipline. Besides this, we have entered our solemn protest, as we have a sure right to do, against the principle that the sentence of any Court, Ecclesiastical or Civil, should force on us—on our obedience, or on our support, a Minister whose conduct has taken away the respect with which we once so willingly regarded him. But having taken this step, we must *patiently* abide its issue—we must not be discouraged by delay—nor give up the principle on which we have hitherto acted, of standing by our Bishop in support of the Church in her solemn protest against the encroachments of individual ambition. Some no doubt will fall under this trial—some will fall away and apostatize from the Faith, and the cause of truth will lose the support and influence which they might have given. We who understand our position, must stand the more firmly—unshaken by ill success, or by the cowardice of those who leave us—confident in the justice of our cause, and in the favor of Him who has always prospered the attempt of those, who trusting in Him, have set themselves to reform abuses in the Church.

NO. III.

FELLOW CHURCHMEN,—there are some in this Parish who would fain persuade us that we magnify the evils we protest against, and by our complaining make them worse—that we are making trouble out of nothing, and willfully strive to perpetuate discontent, without any sufficient grievance. The Lord be judge between us. Let facts speak for themselves.

Three years ago we lost our long and much beloved spiritual head—What was the condition of our Parish then? We were emphatically, at peace. Old sores were healed by the tears of grief for our irreparable loss. Old strife ceased—older friendships re-cemented, we hoped forever, over the tomb of him whose voice had so often urged upon us harmony and peace. We were all as one, ready to begin anew, and to work the Lord's work in Christian concord. Our new Rector came. With one consent we welcomed him—we looked to him to impart a fresh life to our plans, to throw the energy of manhood's prime into the schemes we might adopt for the advancement of our interests as a congregation. Our finances, accumulated through many years, and saved with faithful economy, were now brought forth; and we determined to put our whole strength to the labor we undertook, at the earnest solicitation of our new Pastor. Our hands were daily strengthened by the flowing in of numbers, attracted by his eloquence and apparent piety. If ever a congregation was in a state of unclouded prosperity and peace, we were then. But how is it now? Words can scarce describe the change. Our congregation broken up; some of our people leaving altogether the church of their fathers; others wandering from place to place. Our Rector disgraced and despised. Our Church erected at so much cost, incomplete and empty. A heavy debt weighing us down, and the means of defraying it taken from us.

All these changes have come in the short space of three years, and all the fruit of the working of one man's evil passions. Is this not true? Have we not just ground for complaint?

